

PUBLIC DRAFT 8/16/04
INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM
GUIDELINES

FOR

PROPOSITION 50, CHAPTER 8
AUGUST 2004



DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
AND



STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

THE FOLLOWING INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DRAFT GUIDELINES ARE BEING
PROVIDED FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

THE GUIDELINES MAY BE ACCESSED VIA THE INTERNET AT:

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html>

<http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/integregio.cfm>

PUBLIC MEETINGS TO SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT GUIDELINES WILL BE HELD AS FOLLOWS:

TUESDAY, AUGUST 31, 2004

10:00 A.M.

AYERS SUITES HOTEL

1945 EAST HOLT BOULEVARD

BASQUE AND PYRENEES ROOMS

ONTARIO, CA 91764

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2004

10:00 A.M.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

1001 I STREET

2ND FLOOR – COASTAL HEARING ROOM

SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

THIS MEETING WILL BE WEB BROADCAST FOR INTERNET ACCESS.

CHECK <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/broadcast/>

DURING THIS MEETING PUBLIC COMMENTS MAY BE EMAILED TO

dfa_grants@swrcb.ca.gov

ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY

5:00 P.M. ON SEPTEMBER 30, 2004

PLEASE SEND OR EMAIL COMMENTS TO THE ADDRESS BELOW:

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

DIVISION OF PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE

ATTN: TRACIE BILLINGTON

POST OFFICE BOX 942836

SACRAMENTO, CA 94236-0001

tracieb@water.ca.gov

ACRONYMS USED IN THESE GUIDELINES AND APPENDICES

AB	Assembly Bill
ASBS	Areas of Special Biological Significance
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CWC	California Water Code
DWR	Department of Water Resources
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
PSP	Proposal Solicitation Package
ROD	Record of Decision
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board

INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish the process that the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) will use to jointly solicit applications, evaluate proposals, and award grants under the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program.

These guidelines do not include the Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSP). The PSPs, containing additional detailed information, will be issued separately after these guidelines are adopted by DWR and the SWRCB.

II. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Proposition 50, the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002, was passed by California voters in November 2002. It amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add, among other articles, Section 79560 *et seq.*, authorizing the Legislature to appropriate \$500 million for IRWM projects. The intent of the IRWM Grant Program is to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources and to provide funding, through competitive grants, for projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water. The IRWM Grant Program is administered jointly by DWR and the SWRCB and is intended to promote a new model for water management. Approximately \$380 million is anticipated to be available for IRWM grants during two funding cycles.

The legislature passed several pieces of legislation that impact the implementation of Proposition 50. The various Senate Bills (SB) and Assembly Bills (AB) include:

- ◆ SB 278 (Machado, Chapter 892, Statutes of 2002) requires the body awarding a contract for a public works project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program;
- ◆ SB 1473 (Machado, Chapter 618, Statutes of 2002) provides that DWR will administer 50 percent of the IRWM Grant Program funds and the SWRCB will administer the other 50 percent and requires that not less than 40 percent of the funds to be available to both [Southern California](#) and [Northern California](#). Prior to awarding a grant, DWR and the SWRCB must determine whether projects that include modification of a river or stream channel will fully mitigate environmental impacts;
- ◆ SB 1672 (Costa, Chapter 767, Statutes of 2002) authorizes a [regional water management group](#) to prepare and adopt an integrated regional water management plan; (CWC § 10530 *et seq.*)
- ◆ AB 1747 (Oropeza, Chapter 240, Statutes of 2003) provides specific mandates and guidance for implementing Proposition 50, includes an exemption from the Office of Administrative Law review and approval process, directs \$20 million from the IRWM Grant Program for competitive grants for groundwater management and recharge projects, and includes a preference for water quality projects that will eliminate or significantly reduce pollution into impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including [areas of special biological significance](#);
- ◆ SB 1049 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 741, Statutes of 2003) amended provisions in AB 1747 to provide the State additional flexibility in implementing Proposition 50 programs; and
- ◆ AB 866 (Pavely, Chapter 493, Statutes of 2003) provides a specific mandate to the SWRCB to fund the development of one or more integrated coastal watershed management plans [in watersheds that influence water quality in ASBS and requires consultations with State Coastal Conservancy and the California Department of Fish and Game](#). (CWC § 79563.5)

The CWC requires DWR and the SWRCB to conduct public outreach in the development of guidelines and criteria for the IRWM Grant Program. These guidelines were developed after consideration of input provided in the following venues:

- ◆ Legislative workshops conducted in the Spring of 2003;
- ◆ Meetings of the Economics and Funding workgroup of the California Watershed Council in late 2003 and early 2004;
- ◆ California Bay Delta Authority meeting in February 2004; and
- ◆ Two public scoping meetings in March 2004.

A. FUNDING

Grants will be provided to eligible grant recipients to develop IRWM Plans or Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans (Planning Grants) and to implement projects that meet the requirements of these guidelines (Implementation Grants). Eligibility requirements are contained in Section III.

Funding from the IRWM Grant Program is anticipated to be committed as shown below:

- ◆ First Funding Cycle – Approximately \$160 million
- ◆ Second Funding Cycle – Approximately \$220 million

B. MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT

The maximum grant amounts are:

- ◆ \$500,000 for Planning Grants; and
- ◆ \$50 million for Implementation Grants.

C. MINIMUM LOCAL MATCH REQUIREMENTS

- ◆ The applicant is required to provide a local match.
- ◆ The required minimum local match for an IRWM Planning Grant will be 50 percent of the total project costs.
- ◆ The required minimum local match for an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Planning Grant will be 10 percent of the total project costs.
- ◆ The required minimum local match for the Implementation Grant will be 10 percent of the total project costs.

Deleted:

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The requirement for local match may be waived or reduced to the extent that applicants demonstrate the proposed planning effort or implementation project will: 1) encompass a region that includes at least one disadvantaged community, 2) include representatives of the disadvantaged communities in the planning process, and 3) be designed to provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged community(ies). Such reductions in the required local match percentage would be in proportion to the percentage of disadvantaged population served relative to the entire population in the region. The PSP will provide more detail on the procedures for waiving or reducing the local match.

D. PROGRAM PREFERENCES

The CWC and implementing legislation specifies that preference will be given to specific project types. These program preferences are reflected in the project ranking criteria and will be taken into consideration during the review process ([Section V.F](#)). The program preferences are for projects that, as applicable:

- ◆ Are integrated and have multiple benefits;

- ◆ Support and improve local and regional water supply reliability;
- ◆ Contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards;
- ◆ Eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including coastal watersheds that influence water quality in areas of special biological significance;
- ◆ Are safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities; or
- ◆ Are groundwater management and recharge projects that are located: 1) in San Bernardino or Riverside counties; 2) outside the service area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; and 3) within one mile of established residential and commercial development.

[Appendix E](#) provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the Program Priorities.

E. STATEWIDE PRIORITIES

DWR and the SWRCB will give preference to projects that assist in meeting various Statewide Priorities. Such Statewide Priorities will be taken into consideration during the review process ([Section V.F](#)) and are as follows:

- ◆ Reduce conflict between water users or resolve water rights disputes, including interregional water rights issues;
- ◆ Implementation of Total Maximum Daily Loads that are established or under development;
- ◆ Implementation of Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Watershed Management Initiative Chapters, plans, and policies;
- ◆ Implementation of the SWRCB's Non-point Source Program Plan;
- ◆ Meet Delta Water Quality Objectives;
- ◆ Implementation of recommendations of the floodplain management task force, desalination task force, or recycling task force;
- ◆ Address environmental justice concerns;
- ◆ Assist in achieving one or more goals of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; and

[Appendix E](#) provides a listing of web links for accessing detailed information on Statewide Priorities.

F. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

Plans and projects throughout California will be considered for funding. The CWC requires that not less than 40% of the funds will be available for eligible projects in Northern California and not less than 40% will be available for eligible projects in Southern California. For the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program "Southern California" is defined as the Counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Orange, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, San Bernardino, and Ventura. "Northern California" means all other California counties. In addition to the required 40% minimum allocation of funding to both northern and southern California, additional geographic distribution factors may be taken into consideration during the review process ([Section V.F](#)).

G. PROJECT SOLICITATION

The application process will be structured as two separate project solicitations, for planning projects and implementation projects. The application contents and evaluation criteria are detailed in [Appendix B](#) and [Appendix C](#).

PLANNING GRANT SOLICITATION

Approximately \$10 million will be available for Planning Grants during the first funding cycle. The Planning Grants are intended to foster development or completion of IRWM Plans and Integrated Coastal Watershed

Management Plans, to enhance regional planning efforts, and to assist more applicants to become eligible for Implementation Grant funding. The Planning Grant solicitation will be a one-step application process.

For IRWM Planning Grants, the applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- ◆ Major water-related issues within the region and objectives for the Plan;
- ◆ Consistency with IRWM Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- ◆ Demonstration that applicant is an eligible grant recipient, as defined in [Section III.A](#);
- ◆ Process for development and adoption of IRWM Plan;
- ◆ Schedule for adoption;
- ◆ Participating Stakeholders;
- ◆ Local Match; and
- ◆

For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Planning Grants, that the grant proposal is located in a watershed that is tributary to an area of special biological significance and if applicable, will allow for integration with projects funded by the State Coastal Conservancy. Furthermore the applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- ◆ Major water quality related issues within the watershed and objectives for the Plan;
- ◆
- ◆ Demonstration that applicant is an eligible grant recipient, as defined in [Section III.A](#);
- ◆ Process for development and adoption of Watershed Plan;
- ◆ Schedule for adoption;
- ◆ Participating Stakeholders;
- ◆ Local Match.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: in addition to the above items,

Deleted: /or includes impaired water bodies as identified on the State's 303(d) list, and

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: Consistency with IRWM Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b))

IMPLEMENTATION GRANT SOLICITATION

Approximately \$150 million of funds will be released in the first funding cycle for IRWM implementation projects. Projects must meet one or more of the objectives of protecting communities from drought, protecting and improving water quality, and improving local water security by reducing dependence on imported water and include at least one of the project types listed in [Section III.C](#). The Implementation Grant program is designed for projects that are ready for or nearly ready to proceed to construction.

A two-step application process will be used to evaluate the proposed implementation projects. In Step 1, the Implementation Grant application must be submitted by regional agencies or groups, and the applicant must provide documentation of the following:

- ◆ Complete copy of the IRWM Plan, with proof of formal adoption by all participants;
- ◆ Demonstrated consistency with IRWM Standards (CWC § 79562.5(b));
- ◆ Description of specific implementation project(s) for which funding is being requested;
- ◆ Demonstrations that the applicant is an eligible grant recipient, as defined in [Section III.A](#);
- ◆ Prioritization of proposed projects listed in the IRWM Plan and within the application; and
- ◆ Local match for the proposed project(s).

The application must be submitted by regional agencies or regional water management groups, of which at least one is an eligible grant recipient, i.e. a public agency or non-profit organization. DWR and the SWRCB will evaluate the IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 1 applications, based on the criteria identified in [Appendix C, Section C.2](#). Selected applicants will be invited to compete for grant funding by submitting a detailed application under Step 2. To ensure that Step 2 is a competitive process, the total dollar value of applications from Step 1 invited to submit for Step 2 will be in excess of the total grant funding available in a funding cycle. In Step 2, the applicants will prepare a detailed project-focused proposal to provide technical, financial, environmental, and other information for the project or suite of projects proposed for funding. DWR and the SWRCB will evaluate the Step 2 proposals against the criteria in [Appendix C, Section C.4](#).

III. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A. Eligible Grant Recipients

Eligible grant recipients are [public agencies](#) and [non-profit organizations](#), as defined in Appendix D.

DWR and the SWRCB encourage partnerships to enhance the integration of water management throughout regions of California. Parties that wish to collaborate on a project may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship, a joint venture partnership, a joint powers authority, or other appropriate mechanism. Grant agreements will be executed with only one grant recipient for the region, which will then provide funding to the project proponents responsible to implement the awarded projects within the region. Applicants must identify one party responsible for payments, reporting, and accounting that meets the requirements for an eligible grant recipient. The application must include a detailed description of how the partners will operate, including the allocation of decision-making authority and liability.

B. Eligibility Criteria

Applications for IRWM grants must meet all Eligibility Criteria in order to be considered for funding. The Eligibility Criteria are as follows:

- ◆ Urban Water Management Planning Act Compliance – The Urban Water Management Planning Act (UWMPA or the Act), CWC § 10610 *et seq.* provides that urban water suppliers must prepare, adopt, and submit urban water management plans to DWR in compliance with the Act in order to be eligible to receive funding. Applicants or participating agencies that are urban water suppliers, as defined in CWC § 10617, must provide evidence of compliance with the UWMPA;
- ◆ Groundwater Management Plan Compliance – For groundwater management and recharge projects and for projects with potential groundwater impacts, the applicant must demonstrate that they either have an approved Groundwater Management Plan in compliance with CWC § 10753.7, or are in the process of updating their plan to meet the requirements of CWC § 10753.7; and
- ◆ Consistency with an [adopted IRWM Plan](#) – An applicant's IRWM implementation project must be consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan that meets the minimum IRWM Plan standards as shown in Appendix A. This requirement may be waived if the agency or organization can show that it is engaged in the development of an IRWM Plan and that the IRWM Plan will be adopted before January 1, 2007 and demonstrates how the project fits into achieving the IRWM Plan objective(s) as evidenced by a draft IRWM Plan. (CWC § 79562.5(c))

C. Eligible Proposals/Project Types

The IRWM Grant Program provides funding for projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water.

For Planning Grants, eligible proposals include:

- ◆ Development of new IRWM Plans;

- ◆ Completion or modification of IRWM Plans in progress; or
- ◆ Development of Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans;

For Implementation Grants, eligible proposals must include one or more of the following water management elements (CWC § 79561):

- ◆ Programs for water supply reliability, water conservation, and water use efficiency;
- ◆ Storm water capture, storage, treatment, and management;
- ◆ Removal of invasive non-native plants, the creation and enhancement of wetlands, and the acquisition, protection, and restoration of open space and watershed lands;
- ◆ Non point source pollution reduction, management, and monitoring;
- ◆ Groundwater recharge and management projects;
- ◆ Contaminant and salt removal through reclamation, desalting, and other treatment technologies;
- ◆ Water banking, water exchange, water reclamation, and improvement of water quality;
- ◆ Planning and implementation of multipurpose flood control programs that protect property; and improve water quality, storm water capture and percolation; and protect or improve wildlife habitat;
- ◆ Watershed management planning and implementation; and
- ◆ Demonstration projects to develop new drinking water treatment and distribution methods.

Proposals that include on-stream or off-stream surface water storage facilities **are not** eligible for funding (CWC § 79560). For the Implementation Grant Program, flood control and watershed management proposals must, at a minimum, include an implementation component.

The eligibility requirements for each grant program, as summarized below:

TABLE 1 – ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION

IRWM PLANNING GRANTS	Yes/No
Is the applicant a public agency or non-profit organization in accordance with Section III of these guidelines?	
If applicable, has an Urban Water Management Plan been adopted by the required agency and has this Plan been approved by DWR? <u>This does not apply to Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Planning Grants.</u>	
Is the proposal an eligible proposal identified in Section III.C?	
STEP 1 IMPLEMENTATION GRANT	Yes/No
Is the applicant a public agency or non-profit organization in accordance with Section III of these guidelines?	
If applicable, has an Urban Water Management Plan been adopted by the required agency and has this Plan been approved by DWR?	
If applicable, has a Groundwater Management Plan consistent with CWC § 10753.7 been adopted by the applicant or is the applicant in the process of adopting a Groundwater Management Plan that will be consistent with CWC § 10753.7?	
Is the proposed project consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan or is the applicant in the process of developing an IRWM Plan that will be adopted before January 1, 2007?	
Does the proposal include one or more eligible water management elements identified in Section III.C?	
STEP 2 IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS	Yes/No
Is the applicant a public agency or non-profit organization in accordance with Section III of these guidelines?	
If applicable, has an Urban Water Management Plan been adopted by the required agency(ies) and has this Plan been approved by DWR?	
If applicable, has a Groundwater Management Plan consistent with CWC § 10753.7 been adopted by the applicant or is the applicant in the process of adopting a Groundwater Management Plan that will be consistent with CWC § 10753.7?	
Is the proposed project consistent with an adopted IRWM Plan or is the applicant in the process of developing an IRWM Plan that will be adopted before January 1, 2007?	
Does the proposal include one or more eligible water management elements identified in Section III.C?	

IV GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

A. Conflict of Interest

All participants are subject to State and federal conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the application being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal action may also be taken. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding conflict of interest requirements. Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 1090 and California Public Contract Code §§ 10410 and 10411.

B. Confidentiality

Once the proposal has been submitted to DWR and the SWRCB, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

C. Labor Code Compliance

California Labor Code § 1771.8 requires the body awarding a contract for a public work project financed in any part with funds made available by Proposition 50 to adopt and enforce a labor compliance program pursuant to California Labor Code § 1771.5(b).

D. Modification of a River or Stream Channel

Any projects that include any modification of a river or stream channel must fully mitigate any environmental impacts resulting from that modification. (CWC § 79560)

E. CEQA Compliance

Activities funded under Proposition 50 must be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 2100 *et seq.*). See [Appendix E](#) for web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook. (CWC § 79506)

F. CALFED Program Consistency

Any project that assists in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision (ROD) and must be implemented, to the maximum extent possible, through local and regional programs. See [Appendix E](#) for web links to the CALFED Programmatic ROD. (CWC § 79509)

G. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements

Any groundwater projects and projects that affect groundwater shall include groundwater monitoring requirements consistent with the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (Part 2.76 [commencing with § 10780] of Division 26 of the CWC).

H. Watershed Management Plan Consistency

Any watershed protection activities must be consistent with the applicable, adopted, local watershed management plans and the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) adopted by the RWQCB. See [Appendix E](#) for web links to the Basin Plans. (CWC § 79507)

I. Waiver of Litigation Rights

Grant agreements funded by the SWRCB will specify that acceptance of grant funds constitutes a waiver of litigation rights (including pending actions) to challenge any SWRCB or RWQCB regulation or order that requires performance of the project or whose conditions would be satisfied, in whole or in part, by performance of the project.

V. PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A. Solicitation Notice

A PSP for the IRWM Planning Grant, [Coastal Integrated Watershed Management Planning Grant](#), and Step 1 IRWM Implementation Grant programs will be issued within two months after adoption of these guidelines. The PSPs will provide more detailed instructions on the mechanics of submitting proposals and specific information on submittal requirements. The PSPs will be posted on DWR and the SWRCB websites at:

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html>

<http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/integrehio.cfm>

and will be e-mailed to all interested parties on the IRWM Grant Program mailing list. In order to be placed on the e-mail list, please e-mail your contact information to:

dfa_grants@swrcb.ca.gov

Paper copies of the PSPs will be made available upon request.

B. Applicant Assistance Workshops

Four informational workshops will be conducted to address applicant questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing their application for the Planning Grants and Implementation Grants. Additional workshops will be scheduled and held for the Implementation Grants, Step 2. The dates and locations of the workshops will be provided in the PSPs. In addition to the informational workshops, applicants are encouraged to seek assistance, as needed, from DWR, SWRCB, and RWQCB staff for developing proposals. Technical assistance on how to prepare an application will be available during the application preparation period (i.e. between the release of the guidelines and the application submittal date). DWR and the SWRCB do not have the resources to provide technical assistance in the form of assisting applicants with the actual preparation of an application.

C. Proposal Submittal

The procedure for submitting a complete proposal will be provided in the PSPs. To the extent feasible, the Planning Grants and Implementations Grant, Step 1 application process will be an on-line process. DWR and the SWRCB will provide assistance to applicants that do not have Internet access to submit an application.

The proposal must contain all the required items listed in the PSP. Proposals may include attachments with supplemental materials and may include design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, diagrams, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other items applicable to the implementation of the proposed project. **All attachments and supporting documentation must be provided by the deadline for submittal of proposal. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be considered and will be returned to the applicant.**

D. Completeness Review

All information requested in the PSP must be provided. Each application will first be evaluated in accordance with the PSP for completeness. If certain sections are not relevant to a particular applicant or project, the applicant must clearly state the rationale for such determination. **Applications not containing all required information will not be reviewed and will not be considered for funding.**

E. Eligibility Review

Complete applications will be evaluated for compliance with eligibility criteria, Section III, above. **Applications that are determined to be ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding.**

F. Review Process

All eligible proposals will be scored by technical reviewers. The group of technical reviewers for each IRWM proposal will include one technical reviewer each from DWR headquarters, the SWRCB, and the applicable RWQCB or DWR District. The group of technical reviewers for each Coastal Integrated Watershed Management Planning Grant proposal will include at least one technical reviewer each from the SWRCB, the applicable RWQCB, the Department of Fish and Game and the California Coastal Conservancy. At least three technical reviewers will be assigned to each eligible proposal. Furthermore, DWR and the SWRCB may request technical reviewers from other agencies, and assign them reviews based on technical elements of the projects. The technical reviewers will individually score proposals in accordance with criteria in Appendices B and C, Tables B.1, C.1, and C.2, as applicable. Following completion of the individual technical reviews, the reviewers will discuss the projects and develop a consensus review and score.

Following completion of the consensus scoring of all eligible proposals, DWR and the SWRCB will convene a Project Selection Panel to review the technical scores and comments. The Project Selection Panel will generate a preliminary project ranking list of the projects and make initial funding recommendations. When developing the

preliminary project ranking list and initial funding recommendations, the Project Section Panel will consider the following items:

- ◆ Amount of funds available for the grant type,
- ◆ Consensus technical reviews,
- ◆ Program Preferences ([Section II.D](#)),
- ◆ Statewide Priorities ([Section II.E](#)), and
- ◆ Geographic distribution ([Section II.F](#)).

The Project Selection Panel may recommend reducing individual project grant amounts from that requested to allow a greater number of high-ranked projects to receive funding. Additionally, the Project Section Panel may adjust individual scores to ensure that: scoring criteria has been consistently applied; the recommended funding list reflects the breadth of the Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities; and that funding is equitably distributed throughout the State.

G. Applicant Notification and Public Meeting

The list of recommended projects will be posted on DWR and the SWRCB websites and the applicants will be notified of the availability of the recommended funding list.

The recommended funding list will be presented at a public meeting held by DWR and the SWRCB to solicit public comments on the proposed funding recommendations. Interested parties will be notified of the public meeting by a notice placed on DWR and the SWRCB websites at:

<http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/irwmgp/index.html>

<http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/integrehio.cfm>

and by a news release informing the public of the date, time, and location of the meeting.

H. Funding Awards

Based on the individual project evaluations, the preliminary project ranking list and initial funding recommendations developed by the Project Section Panel, and the comments received during the public comment period, DWR and the SWRCB will jointly approve a final funding list and the associated funding commitments. DWR's Director will approve the final funding list through DWR's existing administrative procedures. SWRCB approval will take place at a SWRCB meeting. Following approval by DWR and the SWRCB, the selected grant recipients will receive a commitment letter officially notifying them of their selection for a grant, the grant amount, and the granting agency.

I. Grant Agreement

Although the grant solicitation and selection process is being implemented jointly by DWR and the SWRCB, the grant funding will be managed separately. Project oversight will be coordinated between DWR and the SWRCB depending on the scope of the project.

Following funding commitment, the granting agency will execute a grant agreement with the applicant. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by authorized representative of the applicant and the granting agency. Costs incurred prior to the granting agency's commitment to award a grant agreement may not be eligible for reimbursement, but may be considered as a part of the applicant's costs share. Only work performed **after** the execution date of the agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Disbursement of IRWM funds may be provided on a monthly basis to reimburse the grant recipient for work performed. **Advance funds cannot be provided.**

APPENDIX A

IRWM PLAN STANDARDS

Whether applying for a grant to develop or complete an IRWM Plan (Planning Grant) or a grant to implement a project that is part of an adopted IRWM Plan (Implementation Grant), the proposed or adopted IRWM Plan must meet the standards outlined in this Appendix. The “Plan” need not be called an “IRWM Plan.” An existing watershed management plan, integrated resource plan, urban water management plan, or other regional planning effort may be utilized as long as the plan(s) meet the standards set forth below, or is functionally equivalent. For the purposes of this Appendix, “Plan” refers to an IRWM Plan or equivalent.

Listed below are the IRWM Plan standards.

- A. **Regional Agency or Group** – Describe the [regional water management group](#) or regional agency responsible for development and implementation of the Plan. Include the member agencies and organizations and their management responsibilities related to water. Demonstrate that all agencies and organizations necessary to satisfy the objectives of the Plan were involved in the planning process.
- B. **Region Description** – Explain why the region is an appropriate area for integrated regional water management. Describe internal boundaries within the region (boundaries of municipalities; service areas of individual water, wastewater, and land use agencies, including those not involved in the plan; groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, county boundaries, etc.), major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region, including surface waters, ground waters, reclaimed water, imported water, and desalted water. Describe important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries. Describe the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values. Describe economic conditions and important economic trends within the region.
- C. **Objectives** – Identify IRWM Plan objectives and the manner in which they were determined. Describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon, and address major water related objectives and conflicts within the region.
- D. **Water Management Strategies** – Document the range of water management strategies considered to meet the objectives. Not all options will have applicability in every region – provide a brief discussion of why an option is not applicable. In some regions, additional elements may be needed. Strategies to be considered could include:

TABLE A-1 – WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

◆ Imported water	◆ Non-point source pollution control
◆ Groundwater management	◆ Storm water capture and management
◆ Conjunctive use	◆ Flood management
◆ Water recycling	◆ Recreation and public access
◆ Desalination	◆ Wetlands enhancement and creation
◆ Water conservation	◆ Environmental and habitat protection and improvement
◆ Water transfers	◆ Watershed planning
◆ Surface storage	◆ Land use planning
◆ Water and wastewater treatment	

- E. **Integration** – Present the mix of water management strategies selected for inclusion in the Plan and discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. Include a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies.
- F. **Regional Priorities** – Include short-term and long-term priorities for implementation of the Plan. Discuss process for modifying priorities in response to regional changes.
- G. **Implementation** – Identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented. Identify the agency(ies) responsible for project implementation and clearly identify linkages or interdependence between projects. Demonstrate economic and technical feasibility on a programmatic level. Identify the current status of each element of the Plan, such as existing infrastructure, feasibility, pilot or demonstration project, design completed, etc. Include timelines for all active or planned projects and identify the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation.
- H. **Impacts and Benefits** – Include an evaluation of potential impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from Plan implementation. Identify the advantages of the regional plan; including a discussion of the added benefits of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts. Identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution. Identify interregional benefits and impacts. Describe the impacts and benefits to disadvantaged communities. Include an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources, such as air or energy. Include documentation of completion or a plan for completion of CEQA/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and other environmental documentation and permitting, as applicable.
- I. **Technical Analysis and Plan Performance** – Include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in selection of water management strategies. Include a discussion of measures that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operation and plan implementation based on performance data collected.
- J. **Data Management** – Include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public, and include discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs. Assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed. If the Plan includes a water quality component, include a discussion of the integration of data into the SWRCB's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program. [Appendix E](#) provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the SWRCB's statewide data management strategies.
- K. **Financing** – Identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for Plan implementation. Discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects.
- L. **Statewide Priorities** – Identify statewide or State agency priorities that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the Plan or specific projects. Describe how the projects were developed pursuant to Statewide Priorities ([Section II.E](#)).
- M. **Relation to Local Planning** – Discuss how the identified actions, projects, or studies relate to planning documents established by local agencies. Demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. Discuss how these local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two planning documents. Discuss the linkages between the IRWM Plan and general plans, habitat conservation plans, urban water management plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, and other water or land use planning documents.
- N. **Stakeholder Involvement** – Identify stakeholders included in developing the Plan. Identify how stakeholders were identified, how they participate in planning and implementation efforts and how they can influence decisions made regarding water management. Include documentation of stakeholder involvement such as inclusion of signatory status or letters of support from non-agency stakeholders, i.e. those who have not “adopted” the Plan. Include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Plan. Discuss watershed

or other partnerships developed during the planning process. Discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process. Identify possible obstacles to Plan implementation.

- O. **Coordination** – Identify state or federal agencies involved with strategies, actions, and projects. Identify areas where a state agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication, cooperation, or implementation of Plan components or processes, or where state or federal regulatory decisions are required for implementation.

For Implementation Grant applications to be considered for funding, the proposed or adopted Plans must meet all of the following minimum standards:

- ◆ Adoption by January 1, 2007, by all appropriate agencies and organizations;
- ◆ Participation of at least three agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water;
- ◆ A map of the region showing the local agencies in the area covered by the Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects;
- ◆ Contains of one or more regional objectives;
- ◆ Documentation that the water management elements considered include: water supply reliability, groundwater management, water quality protection and improvement, water recycling, water conservation, storm water capture and management, flood management, recreation and public access, ecosystem restoration, and environmental and habitat protection and improvement (CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564);
- ◆ Integrates two or more water management strategies (see Table A-1 – Water Management Strategies); and
- ◆ Project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs.

INTEGRATED COASTAL WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN STANDARDS

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>A. The planning area must be located in a coastal watershed tributary to an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) identified in the 2001 California Ocean Plan.</u></p> | <p>← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> |
| <p><u>B. The plan must include projects that eliminate or significantly reduce pollution into an ASBS. First priority will be given to projects that will improve the water quality in an ASBS into which an impaired stream or estuary drains, or in an ASBS that is itself impaired.</u></p> | <p>← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> |
| <p><u>C. The plan must focus on collaboration through watershed partnerships, so that the plan and proposed projects are integrated with other existing plans and projects (for example, State Coastal Conservancy projects); and the proposed projects have multiple benefits within the watershed.</u></p> | <p>← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> |
| <p><u>D. The plan must demonstrate the applicant's coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. Examples may include attending planning meetings, hosting public workshops, developing MOUs with land-use planning agencies that address coastal water quality issues, and efforts to support changes in local land use plans, policies, or standards.</u></p> | <p>← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> |
| <p><u>E. The plan must identify the appropriate Management Measures and practices of the State's Nonpoint Source Program Plan (NPS Plan) that the proposed projects will implement, identify who will be responsible for implementation, and set a time schedule for implementation.</u></p> | <p>← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering</p> |

- F. The plan's components must be consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas "Watershed Action Plan Outline" (see Appendix X for more information). If the watershed has an existing plan that addresses some or all of the NPS Plan's Management Measures, the applicant must explain what additional planning will be accomplished by the proposed plan.
- G. The plan must assess the status of existing water quality monitoring in the watershed, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed. If the plan includes a water-quality monitoring component, it must allow the integration of data into the SWRCB's SWAMP program (see Appendix E for more details regarding SWAMP). ← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
- H. If the plan covers an urbanized watershed, the plan must include an analysis of the impervious surface cover in the watershed, and how the percentage of impervious surface cover would change at full build-out of current land use plans. ← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
- I. The plan must explain how the proposed projects will contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards. ← --- Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
- J. Preference must be given to funding water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities.

APPENDIX B PLANNING GRANT

B.1 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – PLANNING GRANTS

This section describes the required elements to be included in a Planning Grant application. Specific instructions for application submittal and required content of acceptable proposals will be contained in the PSP. In all cases, the prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program Guidelines, with specific emphasis on the IRWM Plan standards ([Appendix A](#)), the evaluation criteria ([Section B.2](#)), and the PSP prior to submitting an application to ensure that the submittal will meet grant program requirements. For the purposes of this Section, “Plan” refers to either an IRWM Plan or an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan, unless the plan type is specifically referenced.

Applicants must submit a complete proposal by the deadline specified in the PSP. Each application must include Items A through O below to be deemed complete.

A. Project Title, Administrative Information, Summary and Resolution

This section must include the project title and agency or organization responsible for the proposal and its relationship to a regional planning agency or group. The applicant must provide administrative information that will include, but is not limited to the following information: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; project locations include longitude and latitude; basin description; and legislative representatives within the region. The Project Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant will also need to provide a resolution adopted by the applicant’s governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Applicant Authority

The applicant must certify that it is a [public agency](#) or [non-profit organization](#). The legal authorities of the applicant and partners to conduct the work and to receive and spend state funds must be provided. The applicant must also describe any legal agreements among partners that ensure project performance and tracking of funds. **If DWR and the SWRCB determine the applicant does not have the authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State, the applicant will not be eligible for funding and the application will not be reviewed.**

C. Work Plan

The applicant must submit a complete, detailed work plan consisting of a description of tasks, a project budget, and a schedule for development of the Plan. The work plan must include a description of deliverables as well as a description of the final product proposed by the applicant. The project budget must identify local match consistent with the minimum local match requirements [Section II.C](#).

D. Regional Agency Description

Describe the agency or group responsible for development of the proposed Plan. The description should include the relationship of agencies or organizations to water management; how these entities envision adopting a final plan; and the entities to adopt the final plan. This group should include at least one representative from a disadvantaged community if disadvantaged community status is claimed in the proposal.

E. Description of Region or Watershed

Describe the region, or watershed for Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, that the proposed Plan will cover. Explain why the region/watershed encompassed is an appropriate area for water management. Provide a map and narrative description showing internal boundaries to the region or watershed, major water related infrastructure (IRWM Plans only), and major land-use divisions within the region. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources of the region/watershed, and for Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans describe the ASBS, other sensitive habitats (such as Marine Protected Areas) and impaired water bodies; important ecological processes and environmental resources; social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values; and economic conditions and important trends within the region. The applicant must describe the benefits of planning for this region and for IRWM Plans the benefits of managing water within the region as compared to individual local efforts. If applicable, disadvantaged communities within the region should be noted on the figure/map.

Deleted:

Deleted: ;

F. Objectives

Describe the planning objectives for the proposed Plan to address the major water related issues and conflicts in the region. If the planning objectives have not been established, describe a process for determining planning objectives. The planning objectives should relate to the water issues of the region as discussed in the Description of Region, Section B.1.E.

For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans describe how the plan will identify the appropriate Management Measures and practices of the State's NPS Plan that the proposed projects will implement, identify who will be responsible for implementation, and set a time schedule for implementation.

G. Integration of Water Management Strategies

Describe the water management strategies that will be considered in the Plan and how they were determined. If the water management strategies to be considered have not been determined, describe the process that will be used to determine the range of strategies to address planning objectives. In either case, describe how the selected strategies are seen to work together to benefit water management. Discuss the linkages between and integration of the Plan and general plans, habitat conservation plans, urban water management plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, and other water or land use planning documents.

For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, describe how the proposed Plan's components are consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas Program "Watershed Action Plan Outline." [Appendix E](#) provides a link to that outline.

H. Implementation

Discuss activities through which the Plan will be implemented and an institutional structure to ensure implementation of the Plan. If the project implementation component is not developed, describe the process that will be used in the development of the proposed Plan to identify specific implementable projects and prioritize such projects. Include a proposed implementation schedule or a process to develop one that looks beyond the adoption of the proposed Plan.

I. Impacts and Benefits

Describe the potential impacts and benefits of plan development and implementation. If the potential impacts and benefits have not been identified, describe a process for determining impacts and benefits of plan development and implementation. Impacts should be inclusive of the region and adjacent areas. Include in your description a plan for, or progress on, CEQA/NEPA compliance as it is applicable to development and implementation of the proposed Plan. For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, describe how the plan will assess the status

of existing water quality monitoring in the watershed, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed. If the plan includes a water-quality monitoring component, discuss how it will allow the integration of data into the SWRCB's SWAMP program (Appendix E). If the plan covers an urbanized watershed, the plan must include an analysis of the impervious surface cover in the watershed, and how the percentage of impervious surface cover would change at full build-out of current land use plans. Describe your plan to conduct an impervious surfaces cover analysis, and how the results of this analysis will be used to improve land-use planning.

J. Data and Technical Analysis

Describe the types and amount of data that are available to support development of the Plan. Describe studies that have been conducted or will be conducted to support the planning process. The applicant should identify data gaps where additional monitoring or studies are needed.

K. Data Management

Discuss how data used in plan development will be disseminated to the stakeholders, agencies, and the public. The proposal must also discuss how data management efforts will support statewide data needs and how proposed water quality monitoring will allow integration of data into the SWRCB's statewide data management efforts. Specific reporting requirements and formats will be included in the PSPs. Web links to additional information of the SWRCB's statewide data management effort is provided in [Appendix E](#).

L. Stakeholder Involvement

Discuss how the proposed Plan development incorporates stakeholder involvement via existing or planned activities or tasks. Describe specific outreach activities and the target groups. The proposal should include a list of proposed stakeholders, how stakeholders were/will be identified, how they participate in the planning and implementation, and how they influence decisions made regarding water management. Discuss a process by which additional stakeholders may be identified and included during plan development or implementation. If any water related agencies or organizations within the plan boundaries are not included in the planning process, discuss why they were omitted.

M. Disadvantaged Communities

If applicable, the application should discuss how [disadvantaged communities](#) will be involved in the planning process. The application should address whether the region covered by the Plan encompasses disadvantaged communities. The application should document the water supply and water quality needs of such disadvantaged communities and how these needs will be considered in the planning effort.

N. Relation to Local Planning

The proposal must identify existing local planning documents that will be considered during development of the Plan, such as general plans, urban water management plans, habitat conservation plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, etc. Discuss how these local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents.

O. Agency Coordination

Discuss how the proposed plan will provide for coordination and cooperation with relevant local, State, and federal agencies, including efforts to coordinate with State and federal regulatory agencies as necessary for project implementation. In particular, describe how the proposed plan will facilitate coordination of water management with local land-use planning decision-makers.

B.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR PLANNING GRANTS

The criteria for Planning Grant proposals will be used evaluate the extent to which the IRWM standards will be met. For Planning Grant proposals the criteria will apply to the proposed planning work as well as to any work conducted on development of a plan to date. [Table B-1 will be used to evaluate IRWM Planning Grant Proposals and Table B-2 will be used to evaluate Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans.](#) Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “low” and 5 being “high.” The PSP will contain a more detailed description of scoring methods and procedures.

TABLE B-1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PLANNING GRANTS

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Work Plan <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal.</i> Does the proposal include a work plan with specific tasks, schedule, and budget for developing the proposed Plan? Is the work plan clear and implementable? Were deliverables identified? Are the work plan, budget, and schedule consistent with respect to tasks and sequence of tasks? Is the budget reasonable, logical, and supported with other documentation, assumptions, or estimates? Does the budget demonstrate a minimum local match of 50% of the total project costs? Is the schedule reasonable, based on an assumed contract award date, and show a definite end date? Will the IRWM Plan be adopted by January 2007?	5	3
Description of Region <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region.</i> Is the region for the proposed Plan well defined? Was the basis for the region's boundaries presented? Are the water and resource management agencies within the region and neighboring entities to this region identified and included? Are local agencies' service areas included in the proposed Plan? Are the water related features, including impaired water bodies, of this region identified? Were sensitive habitats, including areas of special biological significance, identified? Are the major water-related conflicts and issues defined? Are the benefits of defining this region and managing water within it versus individual local efforts described in the application? Did the application include a figure/map of the region showing the agencies involved in the proposed Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects?	5	1
Planning Objectives <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives.</i> Are the regional planning objectives explained? How were these objectives determined? Will the proposed Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region? Does the Plan include statewide objectives?	5	2

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Integration <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated.</i> Does the proposed Plan include multiple water management strategies or a technical process for determining water management strategies to be considered in the Plan? Does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of how the selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect in water management? Do the water management strategies to be considered meet the IRWM standards? Were the linkages between land use policies and plans and their relationship to water issued discussed? Does the proposed Plan integrate with other existing plans and projects? <i>For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans, will the Plan's components be consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas Program "Watershed Action Plan Outline"?</i>	5	2
Implementation <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation.</i> Does the proposed Plan development have a general schedule for implementation of the Plan beyond adoption or a process to determine such a schedule? Does the proposed Plan include or will it develop an institutional structure to ensure project implementation? Is there a mechanism or process in the proposed Plan that allows for monitoring the performance of the plan implementation and changes to the Plan?	5	2
Impacts and Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan.</i> Will the proposed Plan include an analysis of potential impacts within the region and adjacent areas? Does the proposed Plan include an analysis of potential benefits of developing the Plan? Does the proposed Plan assess the impact and benefits to water supply and water quality? Does the proposed Plan include a process for completion of environmental documentation and permitting?	5	2
Data and Technical Analysis <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal.</i> Will available data adequately support the proposed planning? Have technical studies been conducted, or are they planned, that will support the proposed planning? If applicable, were appropriate management measures and practices, responsibilities, and schedule included?	5	1
Data Management <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures.</i> Does the proposed Plan include a process for gathering and managing data from development and implementation of the Plan and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public? Does the proposed Plan demonstrate how the data management will support statewide data needs?	5	1
Stakeholder Involvement <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns.</i> Does the proposed Plan include processes for stakeholder involvement in plan development and implementation of the Plan, including how they may influence decisions? Are water related agencies and organizations within the region included in the planning process? Are all appropriate stakeholders included? Is there a process to identify and include additional stakeholders?	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Disadvantaged Communities <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns.</i> Does the region include one or more disadvantaged community(ies)? Does the Plan document water supply and water quality needs of disadvantaged communities? Will implementation of the Plan and associated projects benefit disadvantaged communities? Are representative of disadvantaged communities included in the planning process?	5	1
Relation to Local Planning <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plans relationship to local planning efforts.</i> Does the application identify existing local planning documents that will form a foundation for the regional plan? Does the application indicate how local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents?	5	1
Agency Coordination <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues.</i> Does the proposed Plan provide for coordination and cooperation with the relevant local, State, and federal agencies in plan components? Does the Plan facilitate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Does the Plan facilitate coordination with State and federal regulatory agencies?	5	1
Total Possible Points	90	

TABLE B2 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR INTEGRATED COASTAL WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLANNING GRANTS

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
<u>Impaired Waters and Sensitive Habitat Areas</u> <u>Will the proposed project improve water quality in an ASBS into which an impaired stream or estuary drains, or in an ASBS that is itself impaired? = 5 points</u> ▼ ----- ▼ ----- <u>Will the proposed projects improve water quality in any ASBS? = 2 points</u>	5	2
<u>Regional Agency Description</u> <u>Did the applicant describe the regional agency or group that is responsible for developing the plan?</u> <u>What is (are) the relationship(s) of this agency or group members to water resource management?</u> <u>What is the proposed mechanism for adopting a final plan?</u> <u>Who is expected to adopt a final plan?</u>	5	1

Deleted: Will the proposed project improve water quality of any impaired waterbody that is located in or drains to a sensitive habitat other than an ASBS? = 4 points

Deleted: Will the proposed projects improve the water quality of any impaired waterbody? = 3 points

<p>Description of Planning Area</p> <p><u>How is the region that the proposed plan would cover defined?</u></p> <p><u>What are the boundaries?</u></p> <p><u>Who are the neighboring entities to this planning area?</u></p> <p><u>What local agencies' service areas are included in the proposed plan?</u></p> <p><u>What are the water-related features of this planning area, including impaired waterbodies?</u></p> <p><u>Are sensitive habitat areas, including ASBSs and Marine Protected Areas, identified?</u></p> <p><u>What are the benefits of defining this planning area and managing water within it versus individual local efforts?</u></p>	5	1
<p>Planning Objectives</p> <p><u>Are the planning objectives explained?</u></p> <p><u>Does the proposed plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the planning area?</u></p> <p><u>How were these objectives determined?</u></p> <p><u>Will the proposed plan identify the appropriate Management Measures and practices of the State's Nonpoint Source Program Plan that the proposed projects will implement? Will the proposed plan identify who will be responsible for implementation of Management Measures, and set a time schedule for implementation?</u></p> <p>-----</p> <p><u>Does the proposal include the required watershed-based plan elements (see Appendix F)?:</u></p>	5	2
<p>Integration</p> <p><u>Does the proposed plan include multiple water management strategies or a technical process for determining water management strategies to be used in the plan?</u></p> <p><u>Does the applicant have an understanding of how the selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect in water management?</u></p> <p><u>What water management strategies will be considered?</u></p> <p><u>Will the plan's components be consistent with the Critical Coastal Areas "Watershed Action Plan Outline"?</u></p> <p><u>Do the proposed plan and projects integrate with other existing plans and projects?</u></p> <p><u>If the watershed has an existing plan that addresses Management Measures, what additional planning will be accomplished by the proposed plan?</u></p>	5	2

<p><u>Impacts</u> <u>Does the proposed plan include an analysis of potential impacts within the planning area and adjacent areas?</u> <u>Does the proposed plan include a process for completion of environmental documentation and permitting?</u> <u>Will the proposed plan assess the status of existing water quality monitoring in the watershed, and identify data gaps where additional monitoring is needed?</u> <u>If the proposed plan includes a water-quality monitoring component, will it allow the integration of data into the SWRCB's SWAMP program?</u> <u>If the proposed plan covers an urbanized watershed, does it include an impervious surfaces cover analysis?</u> <u>Does the applicant describe how the results of the impervious surfaces cover analysis will be used to improve land-use planning?</u></p>	5	2
<p><u>Work Plan</u> <u>Does the proposal include a work plan with specific tasks, schedule, and budget for developing the proposed plan?</u> <u>Is the work plan clear and implementable?</u> <u>Are the work plan, budget, and schedule consistent regarding tasks and sequence of tasks?</u> <u>Is the budget reasonable, logical, and supported with other documentation, assumptions, or estimates?</u> <u>Is the schedule reasonable, based on an assumed contract award date, and show a definite end date?</u> <u>Will the IRWM plan be adopted by January 2007?</u></p>	5	3
<p><u>Stakeholder Involvement</u> <u>Does the proposed plan focus on collaboration through watershed partnerships?</u> <u>Does the proposed plan include processes for stakeholder involvement in plan development and implementation of the plan?</u></p>	5	1
<p><u>Implementation</u> <u>Does the proposed plan development include an implementable list of projects or a process to identify implementable projects and prioritize such projects?</u> <u>Does the proposed plan development have a general schedule for implementation of the plan beyond adoption or a process to determine such a schedule?</u> <u>Is there a mechanism or process in the proposed plan that allows for monitoring the performance of the plan implementation and changes to the plan?</u></p>	5	2
<p><u>Financing</u> <u>Does the proposed plan include an analysis or process for determining potential funding for implementation of the plan?</u></p>	5	1

<u>Data Management</u> <u>Does the proposed plan include a process for gathering and managing data from implementation of the plan and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public?</u> <u>Does the proposed plan demonstrate how the data management will support statewide data needs?</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Agency Coordination</u> <u>Does the proposed plan provide for coordination and cooperation with the relevant local, State, and federal agencies in plan components?</u> <u>Does the proposed plan facilitate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers?</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Total Possible Points</u>	<u>85</u>	

APPENDIX C IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

C.1 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – FOR IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP I

This section describes the required elements to be included in the Implementation Grant, Step 1 application. Specifics of submittal instructions and required contents of acceptable proposals will be contained in the PSP. In all cases, the prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program guidelines with specific emphasis on the IRWM Plan standards ([Appendix A](#)) as well as the evaluation criteria ([Section C.2](#)) and the PSP prior to submitting their applications to ensure that their submittals meet grant program requirements.

Applicants must submit a complete application by the deadline specified in the PSP. Each application must include the following Items A through L below to be deemed complete. For Step 1 submittals for IRWM Implementation Grants, the evaluation criteria below will apply to: 1) finalized, adopted IRWM Plans; 2) functionally equivalent planning documents; 3) IRWM Plans that are under development; and 4) the project(s) proposed for funding.

For Step 1 the application must be submitted by regional agencies or regional water management groups, of which at least one member is an eligible grant recipient, i.e., a public agency or non-profit organization, and must include projects from one or more of the water management elements listed in [Section III.C](#).

A. Project Title, Administrative Information, Summary and Resolution

This section must include the proposal title, the agency or organization responsible for the proposal, and the applicant's relationship to the regional agency or regional water management group. The applicant must provide administrative information that will include, but is not limited to the following: agency/organization name; address; authorized representative name and phone number; project location including longitude and latitude; basin description, and legislative representatives within the region. The Project Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant will also need to provide a resolution adopted by its governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption

The applicant must provide a copy of an adopted IRWM Plan, including a signed signature page of all agencies and organizations approving the IRWM Plan or other documentation that the IRWM Plan has been adopted. The applicant may submit alternative planning documents that are functionally equivalent to an IRWM Plan and describe this equivalency in detail. The applicant must also provide a discussion on how the alternate documents function as an IRWM Plan. If such functionally equivalent planning documents are utilized, the applicant must provide a copy of each such document and also provide documentation that each individual planning document has been adopted. An applicant may submit an IRWM Plan that is under development and will be adopted by January 1, 2007. Such plans will be evaluated using the same criteria as existing adopted plans.

C. Demonstrated Consistency with IRWM Standards

The applicant must describe how the IRWM Plan meets the IRWM Standards listed in [Appendix A](#). This discussion must address each of the IRWM Standards and how its IRWM Plan meets the specification of each individual standard. To be eligible for funding, the applicant must document that its IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards for an IRWM Plan, [Appendix A](#).

If functionally equivalent planning documents are provided, the applicant must also provide a discussion on how the alternate documents meet the IRWM Plan Standards contained in Appendix A. If the Plan has not been adopted, the applicant must demonstrate that it is engaged in the development of an IRWM Plan, how the proposal

fits into achieving the IRWM Plan objective, and provide copy of the draft the draft IRWM Plan and a schedule detailing the step to be completed and showing that the IRWM Plan will be adopted before January 1, 2007.

D. Description of Proposed Projects

The application must include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding is requested. The proposed implementation project(s) must implement one or more of the eligible water management element listed in [Section III.C](#). The goals and objectives of the project(s) must be identified. Also provide a discussion on how the project(s) is consistent with the IRWM Plan. For proposed IRWM Plans, the applicant must also discuss how the proposed project(s) fit into achieving the IRWM Plan objectives.

The rationale for the proposed project(s) activities and facilities should be sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan. Where requested funding is for a component of a larger project, the proposal must describe all of the components of the larger project and identify which elements of the larger project are the subject of the grant funding request. The description must identify how the integration of the project components provides multiple benefits and identify project linkages that are critical to the success of the project(s) proposed for funding. The project description should match the cost estimate and schedule provided in Sections C.1.E and C.1.F

E. Cost Estimate

The proposal must provide an estimate of costs for each project contained in the proposal. The estimate must provide summary detail of land acquisition costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and local match by each project or task for which funding is requested. More detailed cost information will be required in the Step 2 proposal. The costs estimate should match the project description and schedule provided in Sections C.1.D and C.1.F.

The sources for the local match must be identified. The applicant must demonstrate a commitment of a minimum local match of 10 percent of the total project costs. The requirement for local match may be waived or reduced for applicants that demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities.

F. Schedule

The applicant must provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of implementation of the proposed project(s). The schedule should match the project description and cost estimate described in Sections C.1.D and C.1.E

G. Project Prioritization

The applicant must provide a prioritization of the project(s) within the IRWM Plan and within the proposal itself. The prioritization of the proposed project(s) activities and facilities should be sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to implementation of the IRWM Plan.

H. Need

Relative to the need for the project(s), the applicant must describe the current water management systems and the expected long-term regional water management needs. Describe how the proposed project(s) will help meet those needs. Discuss the local and regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts conditions relative to the need for the proposed project(s). Discuss critical impacts that will occur if the project(s) is not implemented.

I. Disadvantaged Communities

Applicants requesting waiver or reduction of the local match requirements for [disadvantaged communities](#) must demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will be designed to provide significant direct benefits

to disadvantaged communities. The PSP will provide information on the procedures to be used for applicants to receive credit for providing benefits to disadvantaged communities.

J. Program Preferences

Discuss the proposed project elements that meet the Program Preferences identified in [Section II.D.](#)

K. Statewide Priorities

Discuss the proposed project elements that meet the Statewide Objectives identified in [Section II.E.](#)

L. Environmental Compliance

The project proposal must include a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements. The plan should address all the potential environmental and economic impacts of the proposed project(s), including mitigation, as required under the CEQA and, if applicable, NEPA. The plan should also address compliance with local, county, State, and federal permitting requirements. [Appendix E](#) provides web links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook.

C.2. EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR THE IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 1

The criteria for IRWM Implementation Grant, Step 1 proposals will be used to evaluate the extent to which the applicant's proposal addresses the standards for IRWM Plans and how well the proposed project(s) meet regional needs. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high." The criteria will apply to both the IRWM Plan and the project proposal. The PSP will contain the description of scoring methods and procedures.

TABLE C-1 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Adequacy of IRWM Plan		
<p>Consistency with Minimum IRWM Plan Standards</p> <p><i>This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards:</i></p> <p>Was the IRWM Plan adopted by all appropriate agencies or will it be adopted by January 1, 2007?</p> <p>Does the Regional Agency or Group include at least three local public agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water?</p> <p>Was a map of the region showing the member agencies involved in the IRWM Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects included?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan include one or more regional objectives?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan document that the following minimum water management elements were considered: water supply reliability, groundwater management, water quality protection and improvement, water recycling, water conservation, storm water capture and management, flood management, recreation and access, ecosystem restoration and environmental and habitat protection and improvement?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan include the integration of at least two or more water management strategies or elements?</p> <p>Does the IRWM Plan include a project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs?</p>	Pass/Fail	
<p>Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards</p> <p><i>In addition to the pass/fail evaluation above, the IRWM Plan will be evaluated against the entire set of IRWM standards.</i></p>		
<p>Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption</p> <p>Is the IRWM Plan adopted?</p> <p>Did the applicant submit documentation of formal adoption of the IRWM Plan or functional equivalent, or a schedule for adoption by January 1, 2007?</p>	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Description of the Region <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described the IRWM Plan region, and whether the defined region is appropriate to the planning and implementation.</i> Was a map or maps, with accompanying descriptive narrative, showing the region encompassed by the IRWM Plan provided? Did the map/maps include appropriate internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region? Did the IRWM Plan describe the current and future water resources of the region? Did the applicant explain why the region is an appropriate area for regional water management? Were important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries discussed? Did the IRWM Plan discuss the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values; and describe economic conditions and important trends within the region?	5	1
Objectives <i>In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately described appropriate IRWM Plan objectives.</i> Did the IRWM Plan identify regional planning objectives and the manner in which they were determined? Does the IRWM Plan address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region covered by the Plan?	5	1
Water Management Strategies & Integration <i>In addition to meeting the minimum standard for this criterion, scoring will be based on how well the IRWM Plan integrates as wide range of water management strategies.</i> Did the IRWM Plan describe the range of water management strategies that were considered to meet the objectives of the plan? Was a brief discussion of why a water management strategy was not applicable provided? Did the applicant discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives? Was a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies provided?	5	1
Priorities and Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan has adequately described the priorities of the region.</i> Was a presentation of regional priorities for implementation provided? Did the applicant identify short-term and long-term implementation priorities? Does the IRWM Plan discuss how: 1) decision-making will be responsive to regional changes; 2) responses to implementation of projects will be assessed; and 3) project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses?	5	1
Implementation <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is implementable and implementation steps are well documented.</i> Does the IRWM Plan identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented? Did the IRWM Plan include timelines for active or planned projects? Did the applicant identify the entities responsible for project implementation? Were the linkages or interdependence between projects clearly identified? Was the economic and technical feasibility of projects demonstrated on a programmatic level? Was the current status of each element of the IRWM Plan presented? Was the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation discussed?	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Impacts & Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan clearly and fully describes the impacts and regional benefits of the Plan.</i> Does the IRWM Plan include an evaluation of potential negative impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from its implementation? Does the IRWM Plan include the advantages of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts? Does the IRWM Plan identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution? If applicable, does the IRWM Plan must identify interregional benefits and impacts? If applicable, did the applicant describe the benefits to disadvantaged communities? Was an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources provided? Did the applicant document completion or a plan for completion of CEQA/NEPA and other environmental documentation and permitting requirements?	5	1
Technical Analysis and Plan Performance <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.</i> Did the IRWM Plan include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in selection of water management strategies? Did the IRWM Plan discuss measures that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance; monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operation and plan implementation based on performance data collected?	5	1
Data Management <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan provides for management of data generated during plan development and implementation</i> Does the IRWM Plan include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public? Was a discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs provided? Did the IRWM Plan assess the state of existing monitoring efforts, both for water supply and water quality? Were data gaps identified? If applicable, did the IRWM Plan discuss the integration of data into the SWRCB's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment Programs?	5	1
Financing <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan describes a feasible program of financing for implementation of projects.</i> Did the IRWM Plan identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for plan implementation? Does the IRWM Plan discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects?	5	1
Relation to Local Planning <i>Scoring will be based on whether the IRWM Plan is well coordinated with local.</i> Did the IRWM Plan discuss how the identified actions, projects, or studies relate to planning documents established by local agencies? Does the IRWM Plan demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Did the IRWM Plan discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents? Did the IRWM Plan discuss the linkages between the IRWM Plan and general plans, habitat conservation plans, urban water management plans, groundwater management plans, local watershed management plans, and other water or land use planning documents?	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination <i>Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the IRWM Plan includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative regional process</i> Does the IRWM Plan identify stakeholders and the process used for inclusion of stakeholders in development of the plan? Does the process include a discussion of how: Stakeholders are identified, They participate in planning and implementation efforts, and They can influence decisions made regarding water management? Did the IRWM Plan document public outreach activities specific to individual stakeholder groups? Does the IRWM Plan include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during plan implementation? Are partnerships developed during the planning process discussed? Did the application discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process? Were any possible obstacles to IRWM Plan implementation identified? Was coordination with State or federal agencies discussed? Did the IRWM Plan identify areas where a State agency or agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation, or implementation of plan components or processes, or identify any state or federal regulatory actions required for implementation?	5	1
Adequacy of Proposed Project(s)		
Local Match <i>This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that it will meet the minimum local match standard.</i> Did the applicant propose a minimum Local Match that meets the minimum standards as shown in Section II.C?	Pass/Fail	
Description of Proposed Project(s) <i>Scoring will be based on how well the proposed project(s) serve to implement the IRWM Plan and achieve its objectives.</i> Did the application include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding is requested? Do the proposed implementation project(s) consist of one or more of the eligible water management element (Section III.C)? Were the goals and objectives of the project(s) identified? Did the application discuss how the project(s) is consistent with the IRWM Plan? For proposed IRWM Plans, did the applicant also discuss how the proposed project(s) fit into achieving the IRWM Plan objectives? Was the rationale for the proposed project(s) activities and facilities sufficient to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan? For projects affecting water quality, does the application include: A description of the water body that the project(s) addresses and corresponding beneficial uses; A discussion of water quality problems the project(s) addresses including specific pollutants or parameters and the importance of addressing the specific water quality problem relative to the overall health of the region; A description of how the proposed project(s) is consistent with the applicable RWQCB Watershed Management Initiative Chapter, plans, and policies; and For non-point source pollution control projects, a description of which Management Measures?	5	3
Cost Estimate <i>Scoring will be based on whether the costs of the proposed project(s) are well presented and reasonable</i> Did the applicant provide an estimate of costs for each project contained in the proposal? Did the estimate provide summary detail of land acquisition costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and local match by each project or task for which funding is requested?	5	1

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on the reasonableness of the proposed schedule.</i> Did the applicant provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of the implementation of the proposed project(s)? Did the applicant demonstrate that related elements of the IRWM Plan, not proposed for funding, will be completed on schedule?	5	1
Project Prioritization <i>Scoring will be based on the extent to which the proposed project(s) implement the highest priorities of the region.</i> Did the application provide a prioritization of the project(s) within the region and within the proposal itself? Was the prioritization of the proposed project(s) activities and facilities sufficiently detailed to understand the relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan?	5	2
Need <i>Scoring will be based on the degree of need for the proposed project(s).</i> Did the applicant describe the current water management systems and the expected long-term regional water management needs? Did the applicant describe how the proposed project(s) will help meet that need? Were local and regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts conditions discussed relative to the need for the proposed project(s)? Are there critical negative impacts that would result from not completing the projects?	5	2
Disadvantaged Communities <i>Scoring will be based on the degree that disadvantaged communities will benefit from the proposed project(s).</i> Will the proposed project provide(s) direct benefits to one or more disadvantaged community?	5	2
Program Preferences <i>Scoring will be based on the extent that the proposed project(s) meet the specified Program Preferences.</i> Did the application discuss the proposed project elements that will meet the IRWM Grant Program preferences identified in Section II.D?	5	1
Total Possible Points	120	

C.3 PROPOSAL CONTENTS – FOR IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS, STEP 2

The following text describes elements of a proposal for IRWM Implementation Grant Step 2. Specifics of submittal instructions and required contents of acceptable proposals will be contained in the PSP. In all cases, the prospective applicants should review the entire IRWM Grant Program guidelines with specific emphasis on the evaluation criteria ([Section C.4](#)) and the PSP prior to submitting their proposals to ensure that their submittals meet grant program requirements.

Applicants must submit a complete proposal to DWR and the SWRCB by the deadline specified in the PSP. Each proposal must include sections that discuss Items A through L below to be deemed complete. For Step 2 submittals the criteria will apply only to the proposed project(s) for which funds are being requested.

A. Project Title, Administrative Information, Summary, and Resolution

This section must include the project title(s) and the agency or organization responsible for the project and its relationship to the IRWM regional planning agency or group. The applicant must provide administrative information will include, but is not limited to the following: agency/organization name; address; authorized

representative name and phone number; project location including longitude and latitude; basin description; and legislative representatives within the region. The Project Summary must briefly describe the work to be completed with the requested funding.

The applicant must also provide a resolution adopted by its governing body designating an authorized representative to file an application and enter into an agreement for a grant.

B. Applicant Authority

The applicant must certify that it is a [public agency](#) or [non-profit organization](#). The applicant must also provide the legal authorities of the applicant and partners to conduct the work and to receive and spend state funds. The applicant must also describe any legal agreements among partners that ensure project performance and tracking of funds. **If DWR and the SWRCB determine that the applicant does not have the authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State, the applicant will not be eligible for funding and application will not be reviewed.**

C. Work Plan

All proposals must include a detailed description of the proposed implementation project(s) for which funding will be requested. The goals and objectives of the proposed project(s) must be identified. Where requested funding is for a component of a larger project, this section must describe all of the components of the larger project and identify which elements of the project the IRWM grant is proposed to fund. Linkages to any other projects that must be completed first or that are essential to obtain the full benefits of the proposed project must be discussed.

Based on the goals and objectives of the proposal, a description of all work that will be necessary to complete the project or suite of projects must be included in this section. The work plan should include a description of work items to be performed under each task and project deliverables for assessing progress and accomplishments. The description should include as much detail as possible, and explain all tasks necessary to complete the project and how the applicant will coordinate with the granting agency.

A vicinity map must be provided to show the general location of the project or suite of projects. A more detailed map showing at a minimum the location of activities or facilities of the project, the groundwater basins and surface water bodies that will be affected; the natural resources that will be affected; and proposed monitoring locations must also be provided. Disadvantaged communities within the region should be identified on the detailed map.

The tasks shown on the work plan must agree with the tasks shown on the budget and schedule discussed in Sections C.3.D and C.3.E. Additionally, the application must describe how the proposal is consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan and clearly identify any changes to either the IRWM Plan or the proposal that was evaluated in Step 1. The PSP will include detailed instructions on the requested work plan components.

D. Budget

The proposal must provide a detailed estimate of project costs and funding sources. The estimate must at a minimum include the following for each individual project within the proposal:

- ◆ Land acquisition costs, planning and design costs, environmental documentation costs, construction costs shown by project task, or phase, and the contingency amount for the project;
- ◆ All sources of the local match;
- ◆ The amount of local match applied to each task; and
- ◆ Tasks that are completely supported by local match.

The detailed budget should be commensurate with the design stage that is being submitted and be broken out by tasks used in the work plan. The detailed budget should clearly identify the amount of any contingencies amounts and provide an explanation for the rationale used to determine the percentage contingency used in the estimate. The tasks shown on the budget must agree with the tasks shown on the work plan and schedule discussed in Sections C.3.C and C.3.E. Additionally, the application must clearly identify any significant differences between

the Step 2 budget and the cost estimate provided in Step 1. The PSP will include detailed instructions on the requested budget components.

E. Schedule

Provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing of the proposed project or suite of projects. The schedule should show the start and end dates and project milestones. The schedule should illustrate any dependencies or predecessors by showing links between tasks. At a minimum, the following tasks must be included on the schedule:

- ◆ Development of financing;
- ◆ Development of environmental documentation;
- ◆ Project design and bid solicitation process;
- ◆ Acquisition of rights of way, if required;
- ◆ Acquisition of all necessary permits;
- ◆ Construction start and end dates with significant milestones included;
- ◆ Implementation of any environmental mitigation or enhancement efforts; and
- ◆ Post construction project performance monitoring periods.

The tasks shown on the schedule must agree with the tasks shown on the work plan and budget discussed in Sections C.3.C and C.3.D. Additionally, the application must clearly identify and significant differences between the Step 2 schedule and the schedule provided in Step 1, especially noting any project delays. The PSP will include detailed instructions on the requested schedule components.

F. Local Match

Applicants must identify minimum [local match](#) of at least 10 percent for the total project costs. The requirement for local match may be waived or reduced for those applicants that demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities.

For scoring purposes, local match in excess of 10% will be scored on a sliding scale with the maximum point awards for local matches equal to or greater than 60% of the total project costs. For projects that will provide benefits directly to one or more disadvantaged community, the local match score will be determined on a sliding scale adjusted based on the percentage of costs of the project elements that benefit disadvantaged communities relative the total project cost.

G. Disadvantaged Communities

Applicant requesting waiver or reduction of the local match requirements for [disadvantaged communities](#) must demonstrate that the proposed IRWM implementation project will be designed to provide significant direct benefits to disadvantaged communities. The PSP will provide information on the procedures to be used for applicants to receive credit for providing benefits to disadvantaged communities.

H. Economic Analysis

Applicants will be required to provide an economic analysis of their proposed project(s) showing that the project(s) is economically feasible, including an enumeration of the costs of construction and operation of the proposed project, as well as the economic benefits related to water supply and water quality derived from the proposed project that accrue to those parties directly involved in the project. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements of any economic analysis.

I. Other Expected Project Benefits

Describe the other expected project benefits that will accrue to habitat restoration, ecosystem improvements, fish and wildlife enhancement, in-stream flows, water quality improvement, or other environmental benefits; flood

control; recreation and access; energy use and cost; or other benefits not included in Section C.3.H. When economic values cannot be assigned to an expected project benefit, the benefit should be quantified in physical terms. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements for documenting the other expected project benefits. Describe Statewide Priorities ([Section II.E](#)) that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the projects.

J. Scientific and Technical Adequacy

The applicant will be required to demonstrate the scientific and technical adequacy of the project or suite of projects. Such demonstration may include:

- ◆ Submittal of a copy(ies) of all reports and studies prepared for the proposed project that form the basis for or include information pertaining to this application;
- ◆ A brief summary of the types of information in each reference;
- ◆ If feasibility and pilot studies have not been completed for the proposed implementation project(s), an explanation what has been done to determine the project's feasibility; and
- ◆ Provide copies of the most complete design plans and specifications for the proposed project(s).

K. Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

Describe the performance measures that will be used to quantify and verify project performance. Provide a discussion of the monitoring system to be used to verify project performance with respect to the project benefits or objectives identified in the proposal. Indicate where the data will be collected and the types of analyses to be used. Include a discussion of how monitoring data will be used to measure the performance in meeting the overall goals and objectives of the IRWM Plan.

Monitoring and performance assessment are integral parts of project implementation, and all capital and ongoing costs must be included in the budget and economic analysis as appropriate.

L. Program Preferences

Describe the project elements meet the IRWM Grant Program Preferences detailed in Section II.D. Further detail will be provided in the PSP explaining the requirements for documenting Program Preferences.

C.4. EVALUATION CRITERIA – FOR THE IRWM IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2

The criteria for Implementation Grant, Step 2 proposals will evaluate the extent to which the applicant's proposal meets each individual criterion. Each criterion will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high." The PSP will contain the description of the scoring methods and procedures and additional detail on the evaluation criteria.

TABLE C-2 - EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS, STEP 2

Criteria	Points Available	Weighting Factor
Work Plan <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	5	3
Budget <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	5	1
Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the proposal.</i>	5	1
Local Match <i>The criterion will be scored on a sliding scale based upon the percent of local match to total project costs.</i>	5	1
Economic Analysis <i>Scoring will be based on the economic benefits of the project(s) relative to costs. The scores will be assigned relative to all other proposals.</i>	5	2
Environmental and Other Multiple Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on the certainty that the project will provide the benefits claimed as well as the magnitude and breadth of the environmental and other multiple benefits.</i>	5	2
Scientific and Technical Adequacy <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal is scientifically and technically adequate.</i>	5	3
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program that included performance measures.</i>	5	1
Program Preferences <i>Scoring will be based on whether the proposed project meets one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program preferences.</i>	5	1
Total Possible Points	75	

APPENDIX D DEFINITIONS

Adopted IRWM Plan – means an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan that has been formally accepted by the governing body(ies) of the entity(ies) that participated in the development of the Plan and have responsibility for implementation of the Plan as evidenced by a resolution or other written documentation.

Applicant – means an entity that files an application for funding under the provisions of Proposition 50 with the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board.

Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)– means areas designated by the SWRCB as requiring protection of species or biological communities to the extent that alteration of natural water quality is undesirable. All areas of special biological significance are State Water Quality Protection Areas as defined in Public Resources Code § 36700(f). There are 34 designated areas of special biological significance, which are listed in the California Ocean Plan.

Bay-Delta – is as defined in Section 79006 of the California Water Code.

CALFED Bay-Delta Program – refers to the collaborative State-federal program to address ecosystem restoration and water management issues in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system. The CALFED Program is being implemented under the guidance of the California Bay-Delta Authority, by a consortium of State and federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the Bay and Delta, pursuant to the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Record of Decision (August 28, 2000).

California Bay-Delta Authority – refers to the State agency that was established by legislation enacted in 2002 (SB 1653, Costa) to oversee implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Critical Coastal Areas Program – means the innovative program to foster collaboration among local stakeholders and government agencies, to better coordinate resources and focus efforts on coastal-zone watershed areas in critical need of protection from polluted runoff.

Disadvantaged Community – means a municipality, including, but not limited to a city, town or county, or a reasonably isolated and divisible segment of a larger municipality, that has an average median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income.

Eligible Costs – means costs that may be funded under Proposition 50. Eligible costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement acquisition, legal fees, preparation of the application to establish eligibility, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project construction. Costs that are not eligible for grant funding include, but are not limited to:

- a. Costs, other than those noted above, incurred prior to applying for or receiving a grant;
- b. Operation and maintenance costs;
- c. Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;
- d. Establishing a reserve fund;
- e. Purchase of water supplies;
- f. Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;

- g. Support of existing agency requirements and mandates;
- h. Purchase of land in excess of the minimum required acreage necessary to operate as an integral part of the project, as set forth and detailed by engineering and feasibility studies, or land purchased prior to granting agency's commitment letter to award a contract to an agency; and
- i. Payment of principal or interest of existing indebtedness or any interest payments unless the debt is incurred after issuance of a letter of commitment of funds by the granting agency, the granting agency agrees in writing to the eligibility of the costs for reimbursement before the debt is incurred, and the purposes for which the debt

Evaluation Criteria – means the set of requirements used to choose a project for a given program or for funding; the specifications or criteria used for selecting or choosing a project based on available funding.

Funding Cycle – is used to denote the entire grant selection and approval process from initial project solicitation to grant award.

Granting Agency – means the agency that is funding an individual project, with which a grant recipient has a grant agreement, and will be either DWR or the SWRCB.

Impaired Water Body – mean surface waters identified by the RWQCB as impaired because water quality objectives are not being achieved or where the designated beneficial uses are not fully protected after application of technology-based controls. A list of impaired water bodies is compiled by the SWRCB pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

Local Match – means funds made available by the grant recipient from non-state sources, which may include, but are not limited to donated services from non-state sources. For a State agency local match may include state funds and services.

Management Measures – means economically achievable measures for the control of the addition of pollutants from existing and new categories and classes of nonpoint sources of pollution, which reflect the greatest degrees of pollutant reduction achievable through the application of the best available nonpoint pollution control practices, technologies, processes, siting criteria, operating methods, or alternatives.

Non-point Source Pollution – mean a diffuse discharge of pollutants throughout the natural environment.

Non-point Source Pollution Plan – means the plan, developed in collaboration with the RWQCBs and the California Coastal Commission, adopted by the SWRCB to meet the requirements of § 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 and § 319 of the Clean Water Act. The plan addresses California's non-point source pollutions by assess the State's non-point source pollution problems/causes and implementing management programs.

Non-profit Organization – means any California corporation organized under Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the federal Internal Revenue Code.

Northern California – means those counties not listed below as "Southern California".

Project Proponent – means the entity responsible for implementation on an individual project funded with grant funds. A project proponent must be either a public agency or a nonprofit organization, as defined in these guidelines.

Project Selection Panel – means a group of agency representatives at the supervisory or management level assembled to review and consider project evaluates and scores developed by the Technical Reviewers

and to make initial funding recommendations. **Proposition 50** – is the “Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002”, as set for in division 26.5 of the California Water Code (commencing at Section 79500).

Deleted: . For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans the Project Selection Panel will be the State’s Critical Coastal Areas Committee.¶

Public Agency – means a city; county; city and county; district, the state or any agency or department thereof, and applicants eligible for technical assistance under Section 319 of the federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1329) or for grants under Section 320 of the federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1330), which includes State, interstate, and regional water pollution control agencies; State coastal zone management agencies; interstate agencies; other public and non-profit private agencies; institutions; organizations; and individuals.

Region – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a geographic area. The physical area, efficacy, and benefits derived from a regional plan are impacted by many variables (physical, political, environmental, societal, and economic) therefore no physical size or dimension will be prescribed for this term. Rather an IRWM Plan and associated applicant must define it region and explain why the geographic area encompassed is appropriate and yields effective, synergistic, efficient water management planning.

Regional Agency – means public agencies with statutory authority over land-use or water management whose jurisdiction encompasses an area greater than the jurisdictional boundaries of any one local public agency.

Regional Water Management Group – for the purposes of the IRWM Grant Program, means a group in which, at a minimum, includes three or more local public agencies, at least two of which have statutory authority over water supply, participate by means of a joint powers agreement memorandum of understanding, or other written agreement, as appropriate, that is approved by the governing bodies of those local public agencies (CWC § 10537). Other public agencies or community-based organizations may also be members of a Regional Water Management Group.

Southern California – means the Counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

Stakeholder – is an individual, group, coalition, agency or others who are involved in, affected by, or have an interest in the implementation of a specific program or project.

Technical Reviewers – means a group of agency representatives assembled to evaluate the technical competence of a proposed project and the feasibility of the project being successful if implemented. For Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plans the Technical Reviewers will be the State’s Critical Coastal Areas Committee, which includes representatives from the SWRCB, the coastal RWQCBs, the Department of Fish and Game, and the California Coastal Conservancy.

303d List – means the list, developed pursuant to § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, of water body segments within the State that do not meet water quality standards as defined by established Total Maximum Daily Loads.

Total Maximum Daily Load – means the maximum quantity of a particular water pollutant that can be discharged into a water body without violating a water quality standard.

APPENDIX E

USEFUL WEB LINKS

RWQCB Program Priorities

Region 1:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb1/programs/watermanageinit.html
Region 2:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/2004grants.doc
Region 3:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/WMI/WMI 2002, Final Document, Revised 1-22-02.pdf
Region 4:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/html/fundings.html
Region 5:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/available_documents/watershed/R5_WMI_chapter.html
Region 6:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6/WMI/WMI_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb7/wmi.html
Region 8:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/html/wmi.html
Region 9:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/programs/units/grants/wmchT15trgtproj103.PDF
	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/programs/wmc.html

Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)

Region 1:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb1/programs/basinplan/basin.html
Region 2:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/basinplan.htm
Region 3:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb3/BasinPlan/Index.htm
Region 4:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/html/meetings/tmdl/Basin_plan/basin_plan.html
Region 5:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb5/available_documents/index.html#anchor616381
Region 6:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6/BPlan/BPlan_Index.htm
Region 7:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb7/documents/RB7Plan.pdf
Region 8:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb8/html/basin_plan.html
Region 9:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb9/programs/basinplan.html

SWRCB Program Priorities:

303d List:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/2002_cwa_section_303d_list_wqls_020403.pdf
TMDL List:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/funding/docs/tmdlolist.doc
Non-point Source Program:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/nps/protecting.html
Non-point Source 5 Year Plan:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/nps/5yrplan.html
Critical Coastal Areas Program:	http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-nps.html
California's Ocean Plan:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/plnspols/oplans/index.html

SWRCB Statewide Data Management Programs

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/swamp/index.html
Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment:	http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/gama/

DWR

Home Page	http://www.water.ca.gov/
Division of Planning & Local Assistance	http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov
Northern District	http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/nd
Central District	http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/cd
San Joaquin District	http://www.sjd.water.ca.gov/
Southern District	http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/sd
Grants & Loans	http://www.grantsloans.water.ca.gov/
Water Use and Planning	http://www.water.ca.gov/nav.cfm?topic=Water_Use_and_Planning
Bulletin 118 California's Groundwater	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov/bulletin118
Groundwater Information Center	http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov

CEQA Information

Environmental Information	http://ceres.ca.gov/index.html
California State Clearinghouse Handbook	http://www.opr.ca.gov/planning/PDFs/sch_handbook.pdf

CALFED Bay-Delta Program

http://calwater.ca.gov/
http://calwater.ca.gov/Archives/GeneralArchive/RecordOfDecision2000.shtml

California Watershed Portal

http://cwp.casil.ucdavis.edu/

APPENDIX F

REQUIRED WATERSHED-BASED PLAN ELEMENTS:

- a. An identification of the causes and sources or groups of similar sources that will need to be controlled to achieve the load reductions estimated in this watershed-based plan.
- b. An estimate of the load reductions expected for the management measures described under paragraph (c) below.
- c. A description of the NPS management measures that will need to be implemented to achieve the load reductions estimated under paragraph (b) above and an identification (using a map or a description) of the critical areas in which those measures will be needed to implement this plan.
- d. An estimate of the amounts of technical and financial assistance needed, associated costs, and/or the sources and authorities that will be relied upon, to implement this plan.
- e. An information/education component that will be used to enhance public understanding of the project and encourage their early and continued participation in selecting, designing, and implementing the NPS management measures that will be implemented.
- f. A schedule for implementing the NPS management measures identified in this plan that is reasonably expeditious.
- g. A description of interim, measurable milestones for determining whether NPS management measures or other control actions are being implemented.
- h. A set of criteria that can be used to determine whether loading reductions are being achieved over time and substantial progress is being made toward attaining water quality standards and, if not, the criteria for determining whether this watershed-based plan needs to be revised or, if a NPS TMDL has been established, whether the NPS TMDL needs to be revised.
- i. A monitoring component to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation efforts over time, measured against the criteria established under item (h) immediately above.